

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 17. Claims 1-19 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 17 are independent claims.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the personal interview held August 11, 2005. The present response summarizes the substance of the interview. At the interview arguments were advanced that the applied prior art of record failed to show the acquisition of the identification tag numbers, repetitively polling the acquired tag numbers, and deleting the tag numbers upon repetitive alarm indications. The Examiner indicated that reconsideration of the application would be made upon filing of a formal response.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner indicated that the recited term "the microcomputer" at line 7 lacked proper antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite --the microprocessor—to provide express antecedent support for the claim language. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, meet the specific requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg et al. (USPN 4,918,425) in view of Bandy et al. (USPN 6,002,344). The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 7, 10, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg et al. (USPN 4,918,425) in view of Bandy et al. (USPN 6,002,344), and further in view of Sellers et al (USPN 6,064,309), Nichols et al. (USPN 5,748,454) or Zhou et al. (USPN 6,847,892).

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 17 to more particularly the system for interrogating ID tags, acquiring the ID numbers, and upon several repetitive failing to respond, the deleting the non-responsive ID tags. Applicant will advance arguments hereinbelow to illustrate the manner in which the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited and applied prior art. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The applied primary reference to Greenberg et al. discloses a radio system and method for monitoring and locating objects, including individuals, animals and articles, both locally and on a nationwide scale use monitoring base stations communicating by ID code with portable transponders which are secured to the objects to be monitored. The transponder responds to signals transmitted by the base, the latter indicating by an alarm the absence of a timely appropriate response from the transponder. The base is capable of performing and participating in homing techniques to locate a lost transponder. A 'look-up table' of the IDs of all transponders is stored in a general database memory. A secondary 'look-up table' of reported missing IDs is subsequently distributed for the location of the lost transponders.

Greenberg et al. fails to disclose the acquisition of the ID tag numbers so that only the ID tag numbers monitored are the interrogated ID tag numbers, and that upon subsequent polling, repetitive failing ID tag numbers are deleted from the acquired ID tag memory.

The applied secondary prior art reference to Bandy discloses a system and method for conducting an inventory of tags, wherein each tag is assigned a Tag ID and a manufacturer number. Each tag can be attached to an item to take inventory of those items. A tag reader transmits a wake-up signal followed by at least one clock signal. Each tag increments a first tag count in response to the clock signals, and transmits the Tag ID assigned to the tag when the first tag count corresponds to the Tag ID assigned to the tag. The tag reader records the transmitted Tag IDs. When more than one tag transmits simultaneously, the tag stores the Tag ID in order to resolve the contention when the first read cycle is complete. In the second read cycle, the tag reader transmits the contended Tag ID followed by at least one clock signal. Each tag that contended for the transmitted Tag ID increments a second tag count in response to the clock signals, and transmits the manufacturer number assigned to the tag when the second tag count corresponds to the manufacturer number assigned to the tag. The tag reader records the transmitted Tag IDs, completing the inventory of the tags.

The Bandy et al. reference, like the Greenberg et al. reference, fails to disclose the acquisition of the ID tag numbers so that only the ID tag numbers monitored are the interrogated ID tag numbers, and that upon subsequent polling, repetitive failing ID tag numbers are deleted from the acquired ID tag memory.

The remaining applied prior art references to and further in view of Sellers et al, Nichols et al., and Zhou et al., each have no disclosure directed to the acquisition of the ID tag numbers so that only the ID tag numbers monitored are the interrogated ID tag numbers, and that upon subsequent polling, repetitive failing ID tag numbers are deleted from the acquired ID tag memory.

The claims in this application have been revised to more particularly define Applicant's unique construction in view of the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments and for the above-noted reasons is respectfully requested..

Application Serial No.: 10/736,584
Art Unit: 2636

Attorney Docket No. 22519.00
Confirmation No. 5710

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application

Respectfully submitted,



Warren S. Edmonds
Registration No. 39,642
(703) 486-1000

WSE:dht